



MEETING OF THE
TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY OF MARIN
TAM

THURSDAY, May 24, 2007
7:00 PM

ROOM 330
MARIN COUNTY CIVIC CENTER
3501 CIVIC CENTER DRIVE
SAN RAFAEL, CALIFORNIA

MEETING MINUTES

Members Present:

Steve Kinsey, Chair, Marin County Board of Supervisors
Barbara Heller, Alternate, Vice Chair, San Rafael City Council
Susan Adams, Marin County Board of Supervisors
Judy Arnold, Marin County Board of Supervisors
Hal Brown, Marin County Board of Supervisors
Charles McGlashan, Marin County Board of Supervisors
Paul Albritton, Member, Sausalito City Council
Peter Breen, San Anselmo City Council
Larry Chu, Alternate, Larkspur City Council
Mary Ann Maggiore, Fairfax Town Council
Michael Skall, Ross Town Council
Dick Swanson, Mill Valley City Council

Members Absent:

Al Boro, Vice Chair, San Rafael City Council
Thomas Cromwell, Belvedere City Council
Alice Fredericks, Tiburon Town Council
Melissa Gill, Corte Madera Town Council
Joan Lundstrom, Larkspur City Council
Carole Dillon-Knutson, Novato City Council

Staff Members Present:

Dianne Steinhauser, TAM Executive Director
David Chan, TAM Programming Manager
Tho Do, Marin DPW Associate Civil Engineer
Li Zhang, TAM Finance Manager
Jessica Woods, TAM Recording Secretary

Chair Kinsey called the Transportation Authority of Marin Meeting to order at 7:09 p.m.

1. Chair Reports

a. CTC Commissioner Carl Guardino Introduction and Discussion

Carl Guardino, CTC Commissioner, submitted a letter requesting an invitation to visit TAM, which included the following four key questions for TAM to consider:

1. What are top traffic relief priorities?
2. What are the top safety priorities?
3. What are the top alternatives to automobile priorities?
4. How is Marin creatively leveraging limited state dollars?

ED Steinhauser provided a powerpoint presentation in order to provide Mr. Guardino the status of transportation needs in Marin County and innovative ideas that included the following:

- Demand for travel in Marin outpaces growth
- Our commute trips are both local and regional in nature
- While most workers in Marin County live in Marin, one-third travel outside the county
 - a. 63% - Marin
 - b. 14% - Sonoma
 - c. 6% - Contra Costa
 - d. 6% - San Francisco
 - e. 5% - Solano
 - f. 1% - Napa
 - g. 1% - San Mateo
 - h. 1% - Santa Clara
- Congestion is a local problem with a regional component
- Marin is a regional recreational destination
- Alternative Recreational Travel options are limited
- Mobility involves more than the highways
 - 1. Marin is a “graying” County
 - 2. Measure A expanded transportation options for trips to schools
 - 3. Major roads of Countywide significance key to relieving local congestion
- Marin’s Traffic Relief Program
 - 1. Ongoing congestion relief efforts
 - a. Highway 101 – Complete the 30 year goal of continuous HOV lanes throughout Marin County on Hwy 101
 - b. Local Roads
 - c. Transit Support
 - d. Develop Aggressive TDM strategies
 - e. Alternate Modes such as bike/ped
- Road Safety Priorities
 - 1. Areas of heavy traffic movements on Highway 101 remain critical accident locations
 - 2. Local congestion due to school trips significantly reduced through Safe Access to Schools Program under Measure A
 - 3. Interchanges where local arterial corridors meet Hwy 101 are points of conflict for all modes
- Marin’s Safe Access to Schools Program: Enhances School Access & Safety
 - TAM’s Crossing Guard Program
 - Safe Routes Education program
 - Safe Pathways capital improvements
- Alternatives to the Automobile
 - 1. 55% Measure A sales tax to transit
 - 2. Ongoing support for SMART
 - 3. Federal non-motorized transportation pilot program must be continued after SAFETEA-LU
 - 4. Bike/ped facilities continue as critical element to local road and highway projects

5. Bus rapid transit/buses-on-shoulder to be considered.
 6. Ferry service at capacity/expansion of parking and feeder bus service expansion
 7. Consider creative funding elements such as local license fee, congestion pricing on Hwy 101/toll options
- Leveraging State Funds
 1. Successful passage of local transportation sales tax Measure A
 2. City/Town road maintenance assessments
 3. Unified congressional coordination with Sonoma County
 4. Actively pursue MTC fund sources
 5. NTPP
 6. Consideration of future local revenues
 - Planning Well For the Future
 1. CBTP – conducting two detailed planning efforts in Marin “communities of concern”
 2. TOD/Ped toolkit - available this Summer
 3. TLC/HIP in Marin very successful
 4. Parking policy study
 - Ideas Under Construction
 1. Increasing funding for transportation
 2. Completing CMIA projects
 3. Take care of the existing system – roads and transit
 4. Transportation in global warming environment
 5. Advance acquisition of construction materials
 6. Local revenue options
 7. Alternative procurement options
 8. What do we want to look like in 20 years?

Commissioner Maggiore joined TAM meeting at 7:43 p.m.

Chair Kinsey indicated TAM's commitment to open communication on transportation issues, mentioning that they are webcasting live all of their programming, which is archived as well, so transportation is made more available.

Commissioner Swanson pointed out that Mill Valley has some interchange issues with respect to the Tiburon interchange. It would normally be a project funded through STIP, but it is not high on the priority list given the amount of annual funding in the STIP. Also, there is a need for some local support for shuttle services in Mill Valley. He pointed out that they did an extensive amount of research on transportation modeling and it is unbelievable how many daily trips could be avoided.

Commissioner Adams highlighted the comprehensive report provided and believed very good progress in transportation and all modes of transportation is being made in Marin. Disability accessibility must be considered, as well, when looking at roadways and access ways. The project along the Hwy 101 Corridor does not receive as much attention in regard to transit. There is 101 Corridor regional bus transit through Golden Gate and it would be helpful to have that consideration expanded. Also, would it be possible to consider using shoulders of the highway for commuter buses. Commissioner Adams went on to mention that “managing-for-results” has been occurring in Marin, and if they are making the hypothesis that having transit-oriented development and have multi-modes of transportation is really reducing congestion and improving air quality, then they must be able to measure in order to demonstrate that it is helping the environment. They are having a hard time regionally being consistent

on how the data is measured. Her biggest concern is the lack of funds to support the operational cost for public transit, so they must find some balance.

Commissioner Breen stated his appreciation for Mr. Guardino's attendance at this meeting. He noted that one thing that stands out in Marin County is the collaboration that takes place between all groups and various funding sources. Several residents in Ross Valley think the Hwy 101 North/South Corridor is critical. However, the small towns in this area, such as San Anselmo, Ross and Fairfax dedicate an inordinate amount of money and staff time to maintain the regional arterials that exist in this area, such as Sir Francis Drake. Local tax payers question why town resources are being diverted to attend to an arterial that should have a wider funding base than what is provided.

Commissioner McGlashan noted that he served as a representative on the Bay Conservation Development Commission on a joint policy committee where the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) which sets a 25-year vision for transportation throughout the Bay Area was discussed. A question that arose is whether or not new requests for funding should come forward. If one stays focused on congestion relief there may be a missed opportunity to reduce vehicle mileage traveled. The group decided that, they need to focus on alternative modes of transportation such as rail, buses and bikes. In the face of climate change, Commissioner McGlashan stated that he wants to exhort the State to get people out of their cars. He wants to talk about radical ideas of non-motorized transportation. They cannot afford to house their workforce here in the County, so many must commute from outside Marin. The creation of more affordable housing has added to the congestion on the streets and that is driven by the fact that they radically increased the vehicle trips. This is a system effect that connects to everything else. To figure out how to get rid of the single occupant vehicle then options such as shuttles to ferries, buses and train will be good companions to struggles we have regarding affordable housing, environment and climate change.

Mr. Guardino said that he agrees with Commissioner McGlashan's comments. He added that he bikes to work each week and understands the benefits in health, traffic relief and improving the environment. He added that safety is a concern for cyclists.

Commissioner Albritton stated that voters passed a measure that allocates 55% of the tax money to transit. Marin County was committed to transit and getting people out of their vehicles. The county spends 20 times more on transit than it used to due to its relationship with Golden Gate Transit but with that has lost 23% of transit service in 2003 and are in the process of building that back up. There continues to be a lack of shuttles to ferries in Sausalito. He reiterated that the voters passed a measure whereby 55% of the money goes to transit. Mr. Guardino was very pleased with the measure Marin County developed for transit.

Commissioner Swanson asked about the success of Santa Clara's and Berkeley's Ecopass system. Mr. Guardino explained that the City of Berkeley provides Ecopasses for their employees. In the Santa Clara area, the usage of Ecopasses has been focused on the private sector. Approximately 150,000 workers in Santa Clara County carry Ecopasses which allows them unlimited free access to buses and transit. He added that his company has offered the Ecopass for the past 10 years.

Chair Kinsey noted that Supervisor Brown has developed a number of innovative programs centered around free access for students. The Chair added that when discussing the issue of climate change, he remembers that, when MTC did a strategic plan about two and a half years ago, the commissioners were all given topics to focus on and climate change was one of them. At that time, questions were raised about why that topic was included whereas, today, that topic is widely accepted as a given. Half

of the climate challenges that the the Bay Area faces are in the area of transportation. On May 31, he will sponsor a workshop on climate change and extended that invitation to his colleagues.

Chair Kinsey finalized his comments by noting that 27 days ago, a vehicle accident caused a fire which took out a piece of the highway maze in the East Bay. He said that Caltrans in partnership with the regional and transit agencies, should feel a certain sense of pride for the rapid rebuilding that took place. He added that everyone needs to stop and think that it should not take torching highways to get a job done quickly. He encouraged the CTC Commissioners to think about a blue ribbon committee that would include Caltrans, contractors, CMA's and public works directors. He urged Mr. Guardino to think about taking that disaster and using it as a symbol of change that is possible without compromising the environment or safety. He then thanked Mr. Guardino for his attendance and said that he looked forward to his support in changing their environment in California.

Mr. Guardino said that he was excited to hear how this Board is banding together to look at climate change issues. He spoke about a regional plan that was put together by some private companies in the South Bay that address the issue of climate change and he agreed to send a copy of this plan to TAM in order to share best practices. He added that he believes that the CTC staff will be committed to the County's vision. He said that he will only be effective in this role if he has enough wisdom from this Region and counterparts of the State. He added that the CTC meets every month and he would be happy to send the agenda to TAM in order for commissioners to provide additional insight to him on any items of interest before the meeting. He asked for email addresses to receive the monthly emails along with agendas.

Collectively, TAM Commissioners thanked Mr. Guardino for attending the meeting.

Chair Kinsey then acknowledged the continuing challenge regarding the Richmond San Rafael Bridge public access study. Internal efforts are ongoing between MTC and Caltrans to resolve their differences, which he expects will be in the next couple months. He then reiterated the date of his May 31st workshop and asked Commissioners to inform him, in advance, if they wished to attend.

2. Commissioner Matters not on the Agenda

Commissioner Adams suggested that given the changes that may take place with SMART, freight issues, and Highway 101, she would like TAM to look at SMART in relationship to TAM. She felt it is important that TAM is able to understand more fully the impacts. She would like a more critical analysis and requested agendizing a future discussion.

Commissioner McGlashan reported that the freight proposal is moving separately and much faster than SMART, so he recommended contacting NCRA representatives in order to deal with the freight issues and to contact SMART regarding their issues. .

Commissioner Brown excused himself from the TAM meeting at 8:15 p.m.

3. Executive Director's Report

ED Steinhauser provided TAM with an Executive Director's Report for their review that included the following:

- Federal – Executive Director attended a national conference on Public Private Partnership's. Executive Director reported on the state of P3 nationwide and options for Marin to consider.
- State

- Budget – May revise was released the week of May 14th.
 - Draft 2006 STIP Augmentation released
- Regional/Local
 - TAM Board Workshop

Commissioner Swanson said that he assumed the fate of the spillover issue would impact MCTD. ED Steinhäuser indicated that MCTD did not assume any spillover funds in their budget for next year. They did assume MTC STA levels through Prop 1B policy. Also, she reminded the Board that State Budget issues over STA are not hugely impactful on MCTD as 67% of the population share and 80% of the revenue share goes to Golden Gate, so MCTD's share of these funds ranges from 13-33%. In terms of any substantial influence over MCTD's ability to expand or meet growing costs, staff did not believe this fund source will have influence. Staff referred the Commission to their MCTD Board for further detailed information on their budget.

4. Commissioner Report

a. Executive Committee

Chair Kinsey noted that the Executive Committee minutes are included in the supplemental agenda. At the exec Committee meeting, Board members reviewed the workshop and provided input. As a followup to the TAM Board workshop, staff was directed to agendaize an item at the June TAM meeting so that the Commissioners and the public could provide ideas on their visionary approach to how to tackle transportation challenges. This is in preparation for MTC's Regional Transportation Plan update. Also, several Commissioners are interested in more involvement in policy choices/ the question arose regarding should TAM create more standing committees for the Commission. The Chair directed staff to poll the commissioners to get a sense of the answer to this question from the Commissioners. All members are welcome to attend the Executive Committee. They are worried that too many standing committees might dissipate the progress, but they are open to suggestions. Also, they moved forward with securing a lease at 750 Lindero for office space for TAM in combination with SMART and MCTD. The three bodies will share the support space and have their own individual identities as well. He stated that the cost increase was discussed on the San Rafael Fourth Street Project, with an intent that funds could be included in the Strategic Plan Update. They had a discussion about Lifeline funds for the Canal Neighborhood and they supported Lifeline funds for San Rafael to implement improvements per the Canal Community Based Transportation Plan. He further talked to staff about trying set up a way to have more control over the project delivery for the 101/580-connector project.

b. Marin-Sonoma Narrows Policy Advisory Group

Chair Kinsey indicated that the primary purpose of the meeting was to explain the CMIA approval and how funds will be allocated.

Commissioner Arnold announced that the EIR will be ready in June and the group also looked at declaring the area a scenic highway.

c. SMART

Commissioner Breen reported that the SMART Board is getting more involved in transit-oriented development with the railroad project in Santa Rosa. He was very impressed that the Board held firm that there is no way they would support what the developer is proposing. The Board indicated that it

must be a transit-oriented development. The Federal EIS is underway and will be ready January/February of 2009.

5. Consent Calendar

- a. Approval of TAM Minutes of April 26, 2007. Recommendation: Approve.
- b. Programming of Lifeline Funds. Recommendation: TAM recommend to MTC funding of the City of San Rafael's proposal for \$240,000 in Lifeline funding for Canal St. Pedestrian Access and Safety Improvements in the Canal Neighborhood of the City.
- c. 580/101 Project Delivery Status. Recommendation: Authorize staff to request Caltrans designate TAM to be the implementing agency in developing the PS&E and performing and environmental re-evaluation and right of way work for the 580/101 Connector Project.
- d. Contract Amendment – Gail Papworth. Recommendation: Authorize the ED to execute the contract amendment with Gail Papworth for an additional amount of \$15,000.

Chair Kinsey asked for a motion.

Commissioner Arnold moved and Commissioner Maggiore seconded, to adopt the Consent Calendar as amended. Motion carried unanimously.

6. Caltrans Report

Jit Pandher, Caltrans representative, provided TAM with information on the purpose of SHOPP that included the following:

- SHOPP Categories
 - Rehabilitation and Reconstruction
 - Operations
- Selection – Selection of new projects for the SHOPP is based on statewide needs rather than on geographical distribution, since funding for SHOPP projects is not subject to county share or north/south split requirements
- Summary
 - Limited Funding
 - Sharply increasing construction costs
 - Increasing cost of meeting new Legal and Statutory Mandates
 - Increasing SHOPP Needs
 - Increasing Rehabilitating Needs
 - Increasing Reconstruction Needs
- How to introduce New Projects?
- How are SHOPP Projects “Programmed?”
- More info on Internet
 - For SHOPP: www.dot.ca.gov/hq/transprog/shopp.htm
 - For Transportation Programming: www.dot.ca.gov/hq/transportation/index.htm

Commissioner McGlashan discussed the Mill Valley off ramp project and asked if the sheet provided included local funds. Mr. Pandher responded that the cooperative agreement has been approved and that the local funds are separate from the listed project funds, but definitely included in the project. Commissioner McGlashan is very impressed with the work so far, noting the access control wall as well as the new auxiliary lane. He complimented the team on working quickly and efficiently. Mr. Pandher indicated that the project would be completed next summer.

ED Steinhauser discussed two overlay projects: 1) 580 from Richmond Bridge to Highway 101; and 2) Highway 101 up to Novato. Staff desired more discussion on combining the construction work that will occur from these SHOPP priority projects with the construction that will occur on the CMIA projects at the same location, for both locations. . Mr. Pandher agreed to discuss with staff.

Chair Kinsey asked when is the next period in time to submit for the next SHOPP cycle. Mr. Pandher responded that April 2008 is the next period, so now is the time to start discussing if on the local side there are issues or concerns.

7. Safe Routes to School Presentation – Students from Miller Creek Middle School

This item was continued to a future TAM meeting.

8. BPAC Formation/Expansion

Eric Schatmeier, Planning Manager, summarized the staff report and recommended that TAM form a Bicycle/Pedestrian Advisory Committee consisting of six geographic representatives from Novato/Northern Marin, Southern Marin, Larkspur/Corte Madera, West Marin, San Rafael and the Ross Valley. In addition, the BPAC would include at-large representatives of bicyclist and pedestrians, the Marin County Public Works Association (MPWS, two members), and one member each representing the disabled, seniors and schools. This composition creates a 13-member committee.

Chair Kinsey noted that the Executive Committee did review and recommended the 13-member structure.

Commissioner Adams asked staff if this committee would file FPPC reports and participate in ethics training. ED Steinhauser agreed to investigate. They are an advisory committee and will not make final decisions.

Commissioner Adams said she would like to have a representative that is bike savvy or add a marin employer representative . ED Steinhauser would consider this, but the current roles are defined to meet the needs of the group.. She noted that encouraging employers to consider alternative modes lies more within the purview of bringing ideas to the Executive Committee, such as through TAM's upcoming Hwy 101 TDM efforts with employers. This group has a defined task with respect to candidate projects and capital projects for TDA Article 3 and for Regional Bike/Ped and for any issues arising with reasonable accommodation.

Alternate Commissioner Chu believes that the definition seems overly broad, but if that is already defined he would not discuss further. He asked why staff was in support of Option 2 particularly since, if the purpose of this committee is to help assist or advise on local roads, it would have a greater impact to include some representation already included in Option 3. He then questioned if there had been a discussion about this topic with public works directors or managers since each local jurisdiction has unique circumstances. This seems overly emphasized, in terms of the bicycle community, and the representation should broaden the focus or participation into other areas to contribute without being so heavily weighted toward bike and pedestrian needs and access.

Commissioner Maggiore said she thought that the Town of Fairfax was under the impression that they were operating under Option 1 as a model, when she received instructions from their Town Manager. ED Steinhauser explained that the regular presentations to local jurisdictions regarding the separate and distinctly different efforts by TAM to manage bike and pedestrian plan updates requires a local

advisory committee. This countywide BPAC had a different role. Commissioner Maggiore believed more representation of different types should be included.

Commissioner Arnold agreed it is very important that there be a representative from the environmental community and the business community, but perhaps that could be one of the representatives from the Cities. Someone in the business community or maybe the senior could also be a representative from the environmental community, so the 13-member structure could still work.

Commissioner Albritton indicated that he would favor Option 1. He added that there are very specific local issues and he does not think an overly large advisory committee would cause any issues. There is usually less attendance and it is a good idea to have more members. He further believed these are very local and specific issues and encouraged a broader advisory body.

Chair Kinsey expressed concern about these larger committees because a number of towns who do not choose to have a bike committee end up with no logical representative for their town. He is also concerned about participation and filling committee seats as TAM currently faces a challenge filling vacancies within the TAC and COC. They were trying to build on the existing bike and pedestrian group that had some history and some continuing interest in serving in Option 2. The Chair asked staff if there is urgency on this matter. ED Steinhauser responded that MTC mandated the formation of the BPAC. Staff committed to forming this committee in February -March 2007 and now it is May, so this matter does have a sense of urgency to it. TAM is holding \$700,000- \$800,000 in TDA Article 3 funds awaiting formation of the committee. Staff resisted the single representative from each jurisdiction because staff felt the bike and pedestrian facilities should not end at the jurisdictional line. Some kind of geographical representation was necessary, but staff did not want to manage a competition between jurisdictions. Staff is very happy with the activity and reasonable approach as practiced by the current bike advisory group that has more general geographic location. These individuals have expressed a strong desire to continue. It may be feasible that those geographical representatives are tasked with some kind of attendance to the local jurisdictions they represent in terms of checking in with the needs of each of those local jurisdictions. Staff is very concerned and could not support Option 1 which would be a 21-member committee. Staff is concerned about their ability to manage such a group within existing resources, how the group would function, and would prefer to postpone the decision if a 21-member committee is the decision of the Commission at this time.

The item was opened to the public.

Deb Hubsmith, MCBC, indicated that this has been a requirement from MTC for many years. Marin will be the last county in the Bay Area to appoint their BPAC, so she encouraged TAM to take action tonight and support staff's recommendation. Originally, they supported Option 1, but there is wisdom in Option 2 since this committee will focus on broader countywide efforts. MCBC is in favor of staff's recommendation and wants to move forward and meet the requirements of MTC.

Karen Nygren, Marin resident, believes an environmental representative should be included. There are several bicycle advocates that are also environmentalists that would be good addition to this committee. Also, a business representative would bring more interest to the business community.

The public input was closed.

Commissioner Swanson expressed concern with Option 2 because he is not familiar with the individual representing his jurisdiction. Regarding Option 2, he would like to consider having a representative from Southern Marin along with a few individuals from Southern Marin to get together

and then report back to the representative.. Chair Kinsey noted that this is what the individual community bike and pedestrian master plan is suppose to do. The idea would be that a regional Southern Marin representative would have access and respond to the individual bike and pedestrian master plan and staff would be using that as the basis for the discussions about prioritizations.

Commissioner Swanson wanted to know if there is any accountability for the representative of a given jurisdiction to attend the Council meetings. Chair Kinsey noted that the TDA funds have been administered for the last 20 years by the CMA and there has been a remarkably positive process of consensus building and none of those representatives have being reporting back to individual towns and cities. They are trying to build into this a much greater sense of control at an individual level rather than consensus over the relatively limited number of choices (limited funding) through these processes. Also, this committee will be advising to the Executive Director who will then make recommendations to TAM and TAM will be in the position of having the last call on any matter.

Commissioner Albritton asked staff if there would be alternates appointed to the positions. ED Steinhauser responded that it is not in the proposal. Commissioner Albritton asked staff to consider adding alternates.

Chair Kinsey asked for a motion.

Commissioner Arnold moved and Commissioner Albritton seconded, that TAM accept Option 2 and of the seven (7) un-appointed members that one also be a representative of the environmental community and one also be a representative of the business community.

Alternate Commissioner Chu suggested that even if the cities do not individually appoint the person in their region, the TAM Commissioners associated with that particular region would have some say as to whether that person is appropriate. Chair Kinsey explained that, for example, names of those individuals under consideration would be vetted with the TAM Board members from that geographical area.

Commissioner Albritton proposed an amendment to the motion that alternates be included for the regional members. The amendment was accepted.

Commissioner Breen expressed his concern over the importance given to this. This group is advisory to the Executive Director. The folks that volunteer will review projects, not necessarily only representing their individual community. The goal is that they will understand the region that they operate from and will provide advice to the Executive Director.

Commissioner Adams suggested that at least the two "at large" positions be vetted by the larger group and also have a list of candidates to see if they also wear two hats. She said that she believes it would be nice to have some of those qualifiers for candidates that wear multiple hats, which would bring a broader thinking process to the discussion.

Commissioner Maggiore feels that Fairfax needs more representation than less. She added that so often the most innovative ideas come from the smaller towns and they need to have a voice. Chair Kinsey pointed out that Fairfax received over \$300,000 for Center Boulevard improvements and not a single Fairfax representative was on the committee that made that recommendation. He added that it was an indication that up until this evening, TAM's efforts around allocation of bicycle and pedestrian have been a consensus-based process for the last 15 years and the existing committee has delivered

recommendations which have left all satisfied, so from his perspective Commissioner Maggiore's concern is unwarranted.

Commissioner Swanson stated that if Option 2 moves forward he would require a provision that the representative of a particular area, prior to making a recommendation to the Executive Director, would come forward to the individual city or town for a discussion. ED Steinhauser noted that the members of this group will not have the ability to individually recommend projects. The Public Works Departments come forward with the projects and TAM staff will construct a screening process by which to judge the project pool. The BPAC utilizes the screening process to prioritize projects. Local representatives, from public works and/or planning, can fill out an application, and then staff presents a case to this body as to the screening of these projects, the weighting of criteria and prioritization of projects for funding, which is a very difficult process with too many individuals, especially given limited funding. Staff further noted that any final action would be made by TAM.

Commissioner Swanson asked staff if there is a feedback mechanism between the individuals that serve on the BPAC and the jurisdictions in which they represent. Chair Kinsey believed it would greatly limit the volunteer pool. He explained that this group is representing bicycle and pedestrian issues.

Commissioners Arnold and Albritton supported the amendments as follows: to select Option 2; require concurrence from the TAM Board for regional "at large" positions, that there be an opportunity for alternates to be identified; and that there would be environmental and business considerations given to the appointments that are not currently identified. Motion carried. Commissioner Maggiore opposed.

Commissioner McGlashan said that he would like to be consulted, as well, in the case of Southern Marin. Alternate Commissioner Chu asked that staff ensure that the group does not go from advice to advocacy.

9. Release for Comment Period Strategic Plan Revenue & Expenditure Update

David Chan, Programming Manager, summarized the staff report and recommended that TAM open the public comment period for the 2007 Strategic Plan Update. He noted that TAM will need to issue debt in 2008/09. He highlighted major roads projects and that San Rafael requested funding for the Fourth Street project be increased from \$3.0 million to \$4.5 million. Staff is recommended funding for this project.

Chair Kinsey explained that tonight they are releasing the Update for public comment, including review by Commissioners and action will be taken at their next scheduled meeting. Mr. Chan responded in the affirmative.

Commissioner Adams asked staff to add the letter "L", the initial to her middle name, when referencing her name in the future. Also, she asked staff if any money has been spent on safe pathways. Mr. Chan responded that it would take place next fiscal year, which ends in June. Commissioner Adams discussed the \$1.7 million available for safe routes capital projects. ED Steinhauser responded that it is an accumulation of two and a half years worth of funds.

Alternate Commissioner Chu discussed page 47 of the staff report or page 17 of the Strategic Plan in regard to elimination on the use of interest revenues for consideration for allocation to the substrategies. ED Steinhauser responded that the Board took action on the assignment of interest funds for the first 2 plus years to close the gap in the Gap Closure bike path and the Board committed

several hundred thousand of these funds already. Based on policy consideration from last June, TAM recommended that any funds beyond that would be considered for possible maintenance of bike and pedestrian facilities. They are returning with more inventory and information on what that means cost wise. Staff does not believe they will continue to accumulate a lot of interest at the end of this fiscal year and into FY 2008-09, as cash will be drawn down for the Gap Closure and for a number of Major Roads projects. The current policy for interest is that the funds needed to go to expenditure plan-eligible activities, but not to any specific strategy by formula. The Board is free to assign them to any specific eligible activity. In this Strategic Plan, they aggregated them to the entire measure program rather than list them individually by strategy or sub-strategy. This reflects actions the Board has taken in the last year.

Commissioner Albritton asked if this information is available to the public. ED Steinhauser indicated that it will be posted on the website and sent to community centers, libraries and local jurisdictions. Commissioner Albritton directed staff to correct the report because he is the representative from Sausalito. Staff agreed.

The item was opened to public input, and seeing no one wishing to speak, the public input was closed.

Chair Kinsey asked for a motion.

Commissioner Arnold moved and Commissioner Maggiore seconded, to open the public comment period for the Strategic Plan 2007/08. Motion carried unanimously.

10. FY 2007/08 Budget For Public Comment

Li Zhang, Finance Manager, summarized the staff report and recommended that TAM provide comments on the Draft TAM FY2007/08 Budget and release the draft budget for public comments.

ED Steinhauser noted that the recommended cost for the three Marin County employees on loan to TAM increased substantially for next year. Staff will be working with the County to understand that cost increase. Also, staff will accompany this budget with a revised work plan (July TAM board meeting). Staff discussed the possible need for some additional staff support for next year. This is mostly a cost savings mechanism over the cost of consultants that will be used more heavily with a \$42 million program vs. a \$25 million program. This may result in conversion of their professional service costs would occur in the coming year.

Commissioner Swanson asked staff if the current budget is in conformance with the adopted 2006/07 budget as reported. Ms. Zhang responded in the affirmative. Commissioner Swanson asked for clarification about the funding balance on page 86. Ms. Zhang noted the inconsistency and agreed that the table must be revised before release.

Commissioner Adams clarified that with this budget they are recognizing that they will be fully staffed with the exception of this extra consideration and will all fall under what Measure A allows them to spend for staffing. ED Steinhauser responded in the affirmative. Commissioner Adams asked staff what percentage of their budget is being held in reserve. ED Steinhauser responded that 5% of Measure A funds are set aside in reserve.

Commissioner McGlashan asked staff if \$150,000 would be spent this year on the hot lane study. ED Steinhauser indicated that they have not spent any funds yet. Staff continues to work on that matter and will bring a proposal on the first step of that study in September. They might have increased the

funds from \$150,000 to \$200,000 based on reasonable scope, but more details will be provided to TAM at a later date.

The item was opened to public input.

Karney Nygren, Marin resident, discussed Attachment 2 under "*major roads*" and pointed out that they will run out of money in 2014 from Measure A as she reads the document and many priorities listed will not be completed. She asked how they might, in the future, take care of these major roads that do need funding to be repaired. She asked if there is some way to consider those other projects. In regard to the transit section on local reserves, starting in 2011 there is no local transit reserve and expressed concern and asked how that will be addressed.

Margaret Zegart, Marin resident, discussed page 86 and would like to see an evacuation element in this transit planning. She believed it is very important, especially since Southern Marin will be under water and they do have a trail system in their community that has never been adopted by the County and not eligible for funding as described. This is a wonderful opportunity to focus on evacuation routes.

The public input was closed.

Chair Kinsey asked for a motion.

Commissioner Adams moved and Commissioner Albritton seconded, that TAM provide comments on the Draft TAM FY2007/08 Budget and release the draft budget for public comments. Motion carried unanimously.

11. Marin/Sonoma Narrows Memorandum of Understanding with Caltrans

Bill Gamlen, Project Delivery Manager, summarized the staff report and recommended that TAM authorize Executive Director to enter into an MOU with Caltrans and Sonoma County Transportation Authority (SCTA) on the roles and responsibilities for each of the three key stakeholders: TAM, SCTA and Caltrans for the implementation of the MSN project.

Chair Kinsey asked for a motion.

Commissioner Maggiore moved and Alternate Vice Chair Heller seconded, that TAM authorize Executive Director to enter into a MOU with Caltrans and SCTA on the roles and responsibilities for each of the three key stakeholders: TAM, SCTA and Caltrans for the implementation of the MSN project.

Chair Kinsey expressed concern for page 100 under "*issue resolution*," and noticed after creating three levels of review including an Executive Committee under Item No. 1, that Caltrans has ultimate authority over decisions. He believed this was too much a Caltrans document. He would like the word, "*cooperative*" to be more reflective in future documentation.

Commissioner Adams desired clarification on the mechanism of how this policy board is informed regarding issues that occur with these projects. Mr. Gamlen noted that any agreement would be brought before TAM. Also, there will be public hearings for the Draft EIR.

The public input was opened.

Deb Hubsmith, MCBC, asked TAM to please add one additional sentence to the project description on page 95 of the packet. MCBC recommends that at the bottom of the second paragraph that the following sentence be added: *"The project will also include a continuous bicycle and pedestrian facility with a mix of Class 1 pathways and Class 2 bikeways."* Without that sentence TAM could be selling itself short. She reiterated that it is very important that this bike and pedestrian pathway be part of this.

Don Wilhelm, Novato resident, discussed page 95 and raised issue of how and when the design of this project will be determined. There are many issues in terms of right-of-way width, structures, and interchanges and it does not indicate when the process will occur. He further noted that this is a very wordy and cumbersome document.

Karen Nygren, Marin resident, asked Caltrans to give variances and look at other alternatives because the language does not provide flexibility. They will just conform to their standards and this does not reflect what the County desired.

The public input was closed.

ED Steinhauser pointed out that page 6 of the packet reflects the minutes from the April 26th TAM Board meeting, which indicated that the frontage road includes a Class 2 bike and pedestrian facility. While the ultimate project scope includes funding for a continuous bike/ped facility, final phasing and funding has yet to be determined. Staff added that early phases reflect the fact that they are hoping to build a continuous system, but not sure yet whether sufficient funding can be found.

Chair Kinsey added that they are not sure where the funding is coming for several aspects of these projects. ED Steinhauser stated that the purpose of the MOU is an effort at mandating a working relationship between TAM and the Department, so they have a requirement to consult with staff and Board members. Staff recommended refraining from building any scope elements into this document at this time.

Chair Kinsey indicated that they want to explore ideas that may require design exceptions. They desired a whole system of transportation through the region. He added that it does appear to be a one sided MOU and it does not illustrate the collaboration approach as desired. ED Steinhauser said that TAM could bypass the MOU process and work on an individual cooperative agreement which would more closely define direct legal responsibilities for each part of the process. The MOU provided a broad umbrella of cooperation over that more definitive process. Staff would be glad to set this aside and come back with coop agreements which are a more definitive mechanism.

Chair Kinsey stated that, at a minimum, he was directing staff to spend the next 30 days to consider comments heard tonight to determine if the concerns raised could be addressed in the language. He does not want this to be set aside after all this work, but TAM is not ready to accept the MOU tonight.

Commissioner McGlashan wanted to see language that Ms. Hubsmith proposed added to the paragraph which helps set the tone. He is comfortable to bring it back in 30 days and not give up on this document. Staff agreed to go back and spend more time on this.

Commissioner Swanson suggested that staff take the comments back to Caltrans to see if it can be incorporated and asked staff to return next month with findings.

Commissioner Adams hoped they can work cooperatively, but she would like to see how that is reflected. If bike issues are not needed to be called out in this document she wanted to know why. They

must be able to reflect what this project will include for them and have the ability as an agency to not be dropped in the loop. She did not want to miss any opportunities. She further believed it is not quite there yet.

Commissioner Breen read this as a process agreement, not a project agreement. This is how they will work together that can apply to any number of projects. Commissioner Arnold agreed with Commissioner Breen's comments, but agreed to withdraw her motion and send it back to staff. She further did not want this delayed.

a. Update on Preliminary Design/TCRP Funds

ED Steinhauser noted that TCRP funds are on a first come/first serve basis. TCRP funding is being moved into design on the Marin Sonoma Narrows and staff will meet next week with Caltrans to go over an expedited process for accessing the funds. Staff is moving forward to begin design activity and have some options with respect to other scopes of the project. Staff added that the preferred alternative would be selected next fall, after a comment period on the environmental document is complete and comments are considered.

12. TAC/COC Appointments

ED Steinhauser summarized the staff report and recommended that TAM accept the nominations as outlined in the attached summary; and continue to actively solicit nominations for the COC and fill any remaining vacancies at future meetings when applications are received from nominating organizations.

The item was opened to public input, and seeing no one wishing to speak, the public input was closed.

Chair Kinsey asked for a motion.

Commissioner Swanson moved and Commissioner Albritton seconded, that TAM accept the nominations as outlined in the attached summary; and continue to actively solicit nominations for the COC and fill any remaining vacancies at future meetings when applications are received from nominating organizations. Motion carried unanimously.

Commissioner Albritton excused himself from the TAM meeting at 10:05 p.m.

13. Hwy 101 Gap Closure Update

Connie Preston, a consultant to TAM from Vali Cooper, announced that the Segment 3 project will move a crane into the median for pile driving next week, so traffic may be mildly impacted. Concrete will be poured on the new connector on Friday June 8th. There is a second tour of the going construction scheduled for June 26th. Staff will send out email reminders. In regard to Segment 4, an open house is scheduled for July 12th at the B Street Community Center in San Rafael. Also, twice a month, updates on construction progress will be posted on the TAM website. She further noted that bid openings for Segment 4 will occur on May 30th and assuming all goes smoothly, construction should start mid July.

14. Open time for items not on the agenda - None

By Order of Chair Kinsey, the TAM meeting adjourned at 10:11 p.m.